

A remark on a theorem of A. E. Ingham.

K G Bhat, K Ramachandra

► To cite this version:

K G Bhat, K Ramachandra. A remark on a theorem of A. E. Ingham.. Hardy-Ramanujan Journal, Hardy-Ramanujan Society, 2006, 29, pp.37 - 43. hal-01111487

HAL Id: hal-01111487

<https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01111487>

Submitted on 2 Feb 2015

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

**A REMARK ON A THEOREM OF A.E.INGHAM
BY
K.G.BHAT and K.RAMACHANDRA**

ABSTRACT. The theorem of INGHAM $[\text{AEI}]_1$ referred to is:

For all $N \geq N_0$ (an absolute constant) the inequality

$$N^3 \leq p \leq (N+1)^3$$

is solvable in a prime p . (It may be noted that the corresponding theorem for squares is an open question even if we assume RIEMANN HYPOTHESIS). Actually INGHAM proved more, namely

$$\pi(x+h) - \pi(x) \sim h(\log x)^{-1}$$

where $h = x^c$, where $c(> \frac{5}{8})$ is any constant. The purpose of this note is to point out that even this stronger form can be proved without using the functional equation of $\zeta(s)$.

§1.**INTRODUCTION.** The three main ingredients in the proof of INGHAM'S theorems are

(A) I.M.VINOGRADOV's deep result

$$\zeta(s) \neq 0 \quad (s = \sigma + it), \quad \sigma \geq 1 - K_1(\log t)^{-\frac{2}{3}}(\log \log t)^{-\frac{1}{3}}, \quad (1)$$

$t \geq 100$, where $K_1 > 0$ is an absolute constant.

(B) Explicit formula for

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \log p \quad ([\text{AEI}]_2). \quad (2)$$

(C)

$$N(\sigma, T) < T^{(\frac{8}{3})(1-\sigma)} (\log T)^{100} \quad (3)$$

where $\frac{1}{2} \leq \sigma \leq 1$, $T \geq 1000$. The precise power of $\log T$ is unimportant. Any constant in place of 100 will do. $N(\sigma, T)$ denotes the number of zeros $\beta + i\gamma$ of $\zeta(s)$ with $\beta \geq \sigma$ and $|\gamma| \leq T$.

1) The toughest part is (A). It follows from the deep result (due to I.M.VINOGRADOV)

$$|\zeta(\sigma + it)| \leq (t^{(1-\sigma)\frac{3}{2}} \log t)^{K_2} \quad (\frac{1}{2} \leq \sigma \leq 1, t \geq 100) \quad (4)$$

where $K_2 > 0$ is an absolute constant and (1) follows from this in a relatively simple way by a method due to E.LANDAU[[KR](#)]₁. For a proof of (4) without using the functional equation see [[KR](#),[AS](#)].

2) Explicit formula uses the functional equation, but an alternative approach is due to [[KR](#)]₂ by the introduction of HOOLEY-HUXLEY contour.

3) The proof of (3) uses

$$\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it) = O(t^{\frac{1}{6}} \log t), t \geq 100, \quad (5)$$

where the O-constant is absolute. The main work in the present note is to sketch a proof of this without using the functional equation of $\zeta(s)$.

§2. **SOME REMARKS** In fact we write

$$\zeta(s, \alpha) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (n + \alpha)^{-s} \quad (0 < \alpha \leq 1, s = \sigma + it, \sigma > 1), \quad (6)$$

and next if X is any positive integer we have

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta(s, \alpha) = \alpha^{-s} - \sum_{n=1}^X (n + \alpha)^{-s} &+ \sum_{n>X} ((n + \alpha)^{-s} - \int_n^{n+1} \frac{du}{(u + \alpha)^s}) \\ &+ \int_{X+1}^{\infty} (u + \alpha)^{-s} du. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Since the last term in (7) is

$$\frac{(X + 1 + \alpha)^{1-s}}{s - 1} \quad (8)$$

and the rest is analytic in $\sigma > 0$, (7) gives the analytic continuation in $\sigma > 0$ of (6). We prove our main theorem which is as follows.

THEOREM. *We have*

$$\zeta\left(\frac{1}{2} + it, \alpha\right) - \alpha^{-\frac{1}{2} - it} = O(t^{\frac{1}{6}} \log t), (t \geq 10) \quad (9)$$

uniformly in the real parameter α . (Note that $\zeta(s, 1) = \zeta(s)$).

§3. **PROOF OF THE THEOREM** We use van-der Corput's theorems (Theorems 5.9 and 5.11 of [ECT]) and after the proof of the theorem we make some comments about the Weyl-Hardy-Littlewood method of proof of (9).

THEOREM 5.9. *If $f(x)$ is real and twice continuously differentiable and*

$$0 < \lambda_2 \leq f''(x) \leq h\lambda_2 \text{ (or } 0 < \lambda_2 \leq -f''(x) \leq h\lambda_2)$$

throughout the interval (a, b) and $b \geq a + 1$, then

$$\sum_{a < n \leq b} e^{2\pi i f(n)} = O(h(b-a)\lambda_2^{\frac{1}{2}}) + O(\lambda_2^{-\frac{1}{2}}). \quad (10)$$

THEOREM 5.11. *If $f(x)$ is real and thrice continuously differentiable and*

$$0 < \lambda_3 \leq f'''(x) \leq h\lambda_3 \text{ (or } 0 < \lambda_3 \leq -f'''(x) \leq h\lambda_3)$$

throughout the interval (a, b) and $b \geq a + 1$, then

$$\sum_{a < n \leq b} e^{2\pi i f(n)} = O(h^{\frac{1}{2}}(b-a)\lambda_3^{\frac{1}{6}}) + O((b-a)^{\frac{1}{2}}\lambda_3^{-\frac{1}{6}}). \quad (11)$$

We now apply these to

$$E \equiv \sum_{a \leq n \leq b(\leq 2a)} (n + \alpha)^{-it} \text{ with } a \geq 10. \quad (12)$$

Here $f(x) = -\frac{t}{2\pi} \log(x + \alpha)$. We have

$$f'(x) = -\frac{t}{2\pi(x + \alpha)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
f''(x) &= \frac{t}{2\pi(x+\alpha)^2} \\
&\text{and} \\
f'''(x) &= -\frac{2t}{2\pi(x+\alpha)^3}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
C_1 &\leq f''(x)a^2t^{-1} \leq C_2 \\
&\text{and } C_3 \leq f'''(x)a^3t^{-1} \leq C_4
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where C_1, C_2, C_3 and C_4 are absolute positive constants. Thus we have

$$\sum_{a < n \leq b(\leq 2a)} (n+\alpha)^{-it} = O(t^{\frac{1}{2}}) + O(at^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \tag{14}$$

$$\sum_{a < n \leq b(\leq 2a)} (n+\alpha)^{-it} = O(t^{\frac{1}{6}}a^{\frac{1}{2}}) + O(t^{-\frac{1}{6}}a). \tag{15}$$

Hence by partial summation we have

$$\sum_{a < n \leq b(\leq 2a)} (n+\alpha)^{-\frac{1}{2}-it} = O\left(\left(\frac{t}{a}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) + O\left(\left(\frac{a}{t}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \tag{16}$$

and

$$t \left(\sum_{a < n \leq b(\leq 2a)} (n+\alpha)^{-\frac{3}{2}-it} \right) = O\left(\left(\frac{t}{a}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}}\right) + O\left(\left(\frac{t}{a}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right). \tag{17}$$

Also we need

$$\sum_{a < n \leq b(\leq 2a)} (n+\alpha)^{-\frac{1}{2}-it} = O(t^{\frac{1}{6}}) + O(t^{-\frac{1}{6}}a^{\frac{1}{2}}) \tag{18}$$

which follows from (15). From (18) there follows

$$\sum_{1 \leq n \leq t^{\frac{2}{3}}} (n+\alpha)^{-\frac{1}{2}-it} = O(t^{\frac{1}{6}} \log t). \tag{19}$$

From (16) there follows

$$\sum_{t^{\frac{2}{3}} \leq n \leq t^{\frac{4}{3}}} (n + \alpha)^{-\frac{1}{2} - it} = O(t^{\frac{1}{6}} \log t) \quad (20)$$

Thus

$$\sum_{1 \leq n \leq t^{\frac{4}{3}}} (n + \alpha)^{-\frac{1}{2} - it} = O(t^{\frac{1}{6}} \log t). \quad (21)$$

We now fix $X = [t^{\frac{4}{3}}]$. The term (8) contributes $O(t^{-\frac{1}{3}})$. We note that (with $s = \frac{1}{2} + it$)

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n > X} \left((n + \alpha)^{-s} - \int_n^{n+1} \frac{du}{(u + \alpha)^s} \right) \\ &= \sum_{n > X} \int_n^{n+1} ((n + \alpha)^{-s} - (u + \alpha)^{-s}) du \\ &= \sum_{n > X} s \int_0^1 \left(\int_0^u (n + v + \alpha)^{-s-1} dv \right) du \end{aligned}$$

and so its absolute value is

$$O\left(\sum_{a > t^{\frac{4}{3}}} \left(\left(\frac{t}{a}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}} + \left(\frac{t}{a}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)\right) = O(t^{-\frac{1}{6}}).$$

This proves our main theorem.

REMARK 1 Let X be an arbitrary positive integer $\geq 20(|t| + 20)(K + 1)$. Then by iteration of the method by which we continued $\zeta(s, \alpha)$ in $\sigma > 0$ (incidentally the method is due to E.LANDAU (Handbuch der primzahlen) we can get the analytic continuation in $|\sigma| \leq (K + 1)$ (K being arbitrary constant) and also the inequality

$$\zeta(s, \alpha) = \alpha^{-s} + \sum_{n \leq X} (n + \alpha)^{-s} + \frac{X^{1-s}}{s-1} + O(X^{-\sigma})$$

where $s = \sigma + it$ (σ arbitrary). (O constant depends on K). For this see [KR]₁.

REMARK 2 A remark on Weyl-Hardy-Littlewood method is necessary here. The proof of Theorem 5.5 of [ECT] goes through to prove

$\sum_{1 \leq n \leq t^{\frac{2}{3}}} (n + \alpha)^{-\frac{1}{2} - it} = O(t^{\frac{1}{6}} L)$ except for trivial complications arising from the presence of the real parameter α . This uses the integer parameter k to be 2. However if we use the case $k = 1$ simple computations show that

$$\sum_{t^{\frac{2}{3}} \leq n \leq Ct} (n + \alpha)^{-\frac{1}{2} - it} = O(t^{\frac{1}{6}} L)$$

whatever the constant $C \geq 10$ be. Here L is some fixed power of $\log t$. These considerations prove the main theorem in view of Remark 1 above. We stress once again that functional equations for $\zeta(s)$ or $\zeta(s, \alpha)$ are not necessary in the proof of INGHAM's theorems. L can be any fixed power of $\log t$ and this is enough to prove INGHAM's asymptotic formula mentioned in the abstract.

REFERENCES

- [AEI]₁ A.E.INGHAM, *On the difference between consecutive primes*, Quart. J. Oxford(1937), 255-266.
- [AEI]₂ A.E.INGHAM, *The distribution of prime numbers*, Stechert-Hafner Service Agency, New York and London, (1964).
- [KR]₁ K.RAMACHANDRA, *Riemann zeta-function*, Publ. RAMANUJAN INSTITUTE (1979).
- [KR]₂ K.RAMACHANDRA, *Some problems of Analytic Number Theory*, Acta Arith, Vol.31(1976), 313-324.
- [KR,AS] K.RAMACHANDRA and A.SANKARANARAYANAN, *A remark on Vinogradov's Mean Value Theorem*, The J. of Analysis, 3(1995), 111-129.
- [ECT] E.C.TITCHMARSH, *The Theory of the Riemann Zeta-function* (second edition, revised and edited by D.R.HEATH-BROWN) Clarendon Press, Oxford (1986).

ADDRESS OF THE AUTHORS

K.G.BHAT,
 N I A S, IISc CAMPUS
 BANGALORE-560012
 Email: kishor@nias.iisc.ernet.in

K.RAMACHANDRA
 N I A S, IISc CAMPUS
 BANGALORE-560012
 Also

TIFR CENTRE
 P.O.BOX 1234, IISc CAMPUS
 BANGALORE-560012
 Email: kram@math.tifrbng.res.in

Accepted on 17-07-2006